

REMARKS

The following remarks are made in response to the Final Office Action mailed April 19, 2010. Claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 10-17, 20, and 22-27 were pending and rejected. With this Response, claims 1 and 14 have been amended. The remaining claims are unchanged. Claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 10-17, 20, and 22-27 remain pending in the application and are presented to put the claims in better condition for appeal and also for reconsideration and allowance.

Reason for the Amendment After Final

Applicants present this Amendment and Response After Final Rejection in order to place the claims in better condition for appeal. Claim 1 has been amended to include a feature of “receiving data corresponding to a request to navigate through links in the Web environment to the Web page, wherein the received data corresponding to the request to navigate is not in response to a display of a navigational structure of the Web environment” (emphasis supplied) from “web page.” Claim 14 also includes an analogous amendment. Support for this amendment is located in the Specification as filed on page 5, and including page 5, lines 12-15, and 19-21, where it states,

Furthermore, the content publishers can navigate to the location within the new site to a web page (or parent web page) where the content is to be published. ... As a result, the content publishers do not need to know the navigational structure of the site or perform coding of relationships among the web pages to be published.

The amended claim features were previously included during the prosecution of the present application. In particular, analogous features were included in the amendment submitted on January 11, 2008, and presented again in the response submitted on July 9, 2008. A subsequent amendment had modified these features changing “web environment” to “web page.”

Applicants submit that the present amendment does not present new issues because analogous claim features were already considered and rejected in at least the Office Action mailed on April 9, 2008, the Office Action mailed on September 17, 2008, and the Advisory Action of December 1, 2008.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-4, 8, 10-17, 20, and 22-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Underwood et al. U.S. Patent No. 7,152,207 (The Underwood Patent) in view of the Giljum et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,745,238 (The Giljum Patent). This rejection includes independent claims 1 and 14.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Underwood Patent does not teach or make obvious these features of claims 1 and 14. Instead, the Underwood Patent teaches “a user selects a particular location in the hierarchy of the site map to publish additional web pages” and “the hierarchy of the of the site map is identified and displayed by a content manager system so the users do not need to know/remember the navigational structure when the navigational structure is displayed on the screen,” as described on page 5 of the Final Office Action mailed June 25, 2009, citing figure 15, column 15, lines 30-35. The display of the hierarchy of the site map represents a navigational structure, and its use is precluded in the independent claims. Applicants further submit that the Underwood Patent does not teach these claimed features elsewhere in the reference.

Applicants further submit that the Underwood Patent does not make obvious these features. The Underwood Patent allegedly teaches navigating within a Web page to a particular location of the Web page without identifying a navigational structure of the Web environment as indicated on page 3 of the Final Office Action mailed on April 19, 2009, citing figures 23-24, column 16, lines 43-46, and column 17, lines 43-50. Navigating within a web page as taught in the Underwood Patent is different than navigating with a web environment wherein the Underwood Patent teaches using a hierarchy to navigate between pages.

The Giljum Patent also does not teach or make obvious these claimed features. Instead, the Giljum patent teaches using a folder with a site structure to manage the website at figure 5, and at column 8, lines 5-10.

Because the amended features are not shown or made obvious in either of the Underwood or Giljum Patents separately, they cannot be found in any proposed combination of the Underwood and Giljum Patents. Applicants respectfully submit that the present independent claims are patentably distinguishable from the combination of the Underwood

and Giljum Patents. Further each of claims 3-4, 8, 10-13, 15-17, 20, and 22-26 depend directly or indirectly from one of independent claims 1 and 14. The dependent claims serve to further define features of the patentably independent claims, and are patentably distinguishable from the cited art by virtue of their dependency. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1, 3-4, 8, 10-17, 20, and 22-26 be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

The Examiner also rejected claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Underwood Patent in view of the Giljum Patent and in further view of the Maeno et al. U.S. Patent No. 7,299,414 (the Maeno Patent). Claim 27 indirectly depends from independent claim 1, which has been shown to be patentable over the combination of the Underwood and Giljum Patents. Applicants submit that the Maeno Patent does not teach or make obvious the features of claim 1 missing in the combination of the Underwood and Giljum Patents. Because the amended claim features are missing from each of the Underwood, Giljum, and Maeno Patents separately, the claimed features cannot be found in any proposed combination of the three references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 27 is patentably distinguishable from the cited art.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection to the claims, and request allowance of these claims.

Amendment and Response Under 37 C.F.R. 1.116

Applicant: Jos Jaspers et al.

Serial No.: 10/749,421

Filed: December 31, 2003

Docket No.: 200901437-1

Title: CONTENT MANAGEMENT IN WEB ENVIRONMENTS

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 10-17, 20, and 22-27 are in form for allowance and are not taught or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 10-17, 20, and 22-27 is respectfully requested.

No fees are required under 37 C.F.R. 1.16(h)(i). However, if such fees are required, the Patent Office is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

The Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's representative at the below-listed telephone numbers to facilitate prosecution of this application.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to Patrick G. Billig at Telephone No. (612) 573-2003, Facsimile No. (612) 573-2005.

Respectfully submitted,

Jos Jaspers, et al.,

By their attorneys,

DICKE, BILLIG & CZAJA, PLLC

Fifth Street Towers, Suite 2250

100 South Fifth Street

Minneapolis, MN 55402

Telephone: (612) 573-2003

Facsimile: (612) 573-2005

Date: June 21, 2010

PGB:RH:cmj:mlm

/Patrick G. Billig/

Patrick G. Billig

Reg. No. 38,080